



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Œuvres de Cicéron. Brutus. Texte latin, publié d'après les travaux les plus récents, avec un commentaire critique et explicatif, une introduction et un index, par JULES MARTHA. Paris, Hachette, 1892. xlvii + 261 pp.

This edition, inviting to the eye with its broad margins and clear print, is one which it will not simply be a pleasure for the student of the Brutus to possess, but a necessity. The materials amassed by previous scholars have been carefully examined, conflicting views tested with independent judgment, the difficulties of the text seriously considered, while here and there an emendation has been offered, but not rashly. The introduction deals, in a charming style, with the date of the Brutus and the circumstances leading to its composition, with its relation to the De Oratore, preceding it by eight years, and the Orator following it, with its historic worth and its sources, with the character of its criticism, and with the somewhat involved question of the MSS and their relative value. The editor justly remarks that while the same spirit animates the De Oratore and the Brutus, the latter contains vague intimations of a menaced attack. Cicero's supremacy in oratory has been questioned by the school of Calvus, and he feels called upon to defend himself against the charge of non-Atticism. The review of Roman orators, with their merits and defects, gives him the opportunity of doing this, but not avowedly. The criticism passed upon the early orators, including even Cato, is essentially literary criticism. They are not flesh and blood orators, with vigorous personal peculiarities of voice and gesture. Indeed, in chapters XV-XXXV only Laelius, Galba and Carbo are vividly portrayed, and this because Cicero must have talked with persons who knew them. For the later period his personal reminiscences were sufficient. For the earlier, while the Liber Annalis of Atticus furnished a prop to his chronology, the Annals of Ennius, the Origines of Cato, the Didascalica of Accius, Lucilius and other sources were ready to his hand. Jordan's hypothesis that Valerius Antias was the source of chapter XIV, Martha does not admit. That his friend Varro, with his enormous erudition, may have come to his aid occasionally is not disputed. The critical attitude of Cicero is on the whole fair, not affected, at least, by political bias. He does not hesitate to praise the Gracchi nor Carbo, but where his own pre-eminence is at stake, in the case of the Atticists, he fails to do full justice. Of the impassioned vehemence of Calvus he says nothing. We need not be surprised if the criticism is too uniformly technical, too much concerned with the question as to whether the three conditions of eloquence are present—natural talent, knowledge and practice—or whether the requirements under the five heads *inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, actio* have been satisfied. We must not complain if a carpenter uses a rule and not a microscope.

In the treatment of the MSS Martha agrees in the main with Stangl, and uses not only F, O and G, but also B, H and M, for the reconstruction of the lost Laudensis. He differs, however, from Stangl in regarding F, which is the codex of greatest authority, as a direct copy of the Laudensis. To B, H and M he assigns much less authority than to the first three. It is to be regretted that he leaves unnoticed Parisinus 7704, upon which Orelli set a high value, and of which he might easily have made a new collation. In the constitution of the text he is very conservative, offering some forty conjectures. The notes are helpful and judicious, on the historical-biographical as well as on the

grammatical-rhetorical side. At the end is a table of proper names, and an Index of Latinity, with especial reference to rhetorical terms.

In §39 *videsne igitur ut, ut*, which Heusinger changed to *vel*, is ingeniously filled out to *Brute*, which is used with *vides igitur* in §231; but here also *ut* follows *igitur* immediately, so that it excites a doubt as to whether the *ut* in §39 is a remnant of *Brute*. In §55 *Ti. Coruncanium* is correctly given in the text, but *T. Coruncanium* in the notes. In §71 *sicin* is bracketed as the exclamation of some archaist surprised at this criticism of Cicero upon Livius Andronicus: "Bah! est-ce bien juste?"—an amusing but hardly tenable suggestion. Possibly *sicin* is due to *sic enim* of the line above, but most editors read *sic*. In §81 *Numerius* is an excellent emendation of *nua serius* F, *una ser* BHM. In §86 *asperior*, Moser's conjecture, seems too far from the MS *adhortor* to meet with general approval, even though elsewhere *asperitas* is made a characteristic of Galba, *actuosior* of Baiter and Kayser, read by Stangl, is much nearer to the MSS, and *ardentior*, the common reading, is supported by §276 and by *ardor* in §93. In §131 *Saufeio* is a beautiful conjecture for the unintelligible *savelio*, and likely to keep its place in the text. In §191 Martha reads *Plato enim mihi instar est centum milium*, adopting *centum milium* as the conjecture of Orelli, although Baiter and Kayser, and Stangl, attribute it to Camerarius. Is it not worth while to call attention to the possibility that *me. illum* of the MSS may be simply a misreading of the spelling MEILIVM, I being read L, as so often? Compare MEILIA, Corp. I 551, 4 and 8, and Lucilius, bk. IX, XIV, Mueller, *meile hominum, duo meilia*, etc. On the use of *ei* in Cicero for *i* see Buechler, Rhein. Museum, XI 515. While *centum* is admirably supported by ad Att. II 5. 1, I do not feel certain that *omnium* is wrong. Compare De Off. 3, 3. 11 *ut omnia ex altera parte collocata vix minimi momenti instar habeant*. Wölflin, Arch. II 584, in his article on *instar*, seems to accept *omnium* without *milium*, interpreting 'er zähle, gelte so viel als alle miteinander.' *Milium*, however, or *meilium*, must certainly be retained.

MINTON WARREN.

The Five Zoroastrian GĀTHĀS, with the Zend, Pahlavi, Sanskrit and Persian Texts and Translations, by L. H. MILLS, D. D., Hon. M. A. Oxon. Parts I and 4. Leipsic, 1892.—A study of the five Zarathushtrian (Zoroastrian) Gāthās, with texts and translations, also with the Pahlavi translation, for the first time edited with collation of manuscripts, and now prepared from all the known codices; also deciphered, and for the first time translated in its entirety into a European language, with Neryosangh's Sanskrit text edited with the collation of five MSS, and with a first translation; also with the Persian text contained in Codex 126 of the Munich Collection edited in transliteration, together with a commentary, being the literary apparatus and argument to the translation of the Gāthās in the XXXth volume of the Sacred Books of the East, by L. H. MILLS, D. D., Hon. M. A. Oxon. Part I. Yasna XXVIII-XXXIV; Part IV. Commentary. Oxford, 1892.

The Rev. Lawrence H. Mills, D. D., a presbyter of the American Church, and distinguished Oriental scholar, has devoted himself for twenty years to the study of the sacred books of the Parsees, and more particularly to the